have cited my work (Banks, 1988). It was this paper that led to the re-introduction of the latter name.

When I verified that the holotype of *C. julieni* is a representative of the South American species generally known by the name *C. euleri*, rather than the North American *C. americanus*, I was immediately aware of the nomenclatural implications because *julieni* predates *euleri*. The first draft of my manuscript was prepared treating *euleri* as the valid name and *julieni* as a nomen oblitum. Aware that such treatment might require formal action by the Commission (Articles 23b, 79c of the Code), I began to gather information to support a request that *julieni* be suppressed. However, I soon found that the name *julieni* had been used several times within the previous 50 years (as noted in Banks, 1988, pp. 90–91), and I believed that the facts would not support a request for suppression. I therefore revised the manuscript using *julieni* as the valid senior synonym. I still consider this action to be proper under the Code although I realize the inconvenience to South American ornithologists.

(2) Walter J. Bock
Department of Biological Sciences, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, U.S.A.

Members of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature (SCON) of the International Ornithological Congress have without exception supported the conservation of *Coccyzus euleri* Cabanis, 1873 and the suppression of *C. julieni* Lawrence, 1864, as requested by Willis & Oniki. They noted that the name *euleri* had been used by almost all workers publishing on the South American pearly-breasted cuckoo and that a change in the specific name for this species would only result in unnecessary instability and lack of universality. The name *julieni* had not been overlooked by avian systematists, but had been considered to refer to *Coccyzus americanus* and was usually placed in the synonymy of that species. Banks (1988) had provided a valuable service to ornithologists by determining the correct identification of the type specimen of *Coccyzus julieni*, but this service should not be negated by causing an unnecessary instability in nomenclature.

In their most recent supplement to the Check-list of North American Birds, the Check-list Committee of the American Ornithologists' Union stated (*Auk*, **106**: 534) that 'the Committee would support a petition to the I.C.Z.N. for the retention of the familiar and more widely used name *E. euleri*'.

Therefore, the SCON supports strongly the three proposals on BZN **47**: 196.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Phororhacos* Ameghino, 1889 (Aves, Gruiformes)
(Case 2723; see BZN **47**: 198–201)

(1) Storrs L. Olson
Department of Vertebrate Zoology, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

Chiappe & Soria propose to conserve the generic name *Phororhacos* Ameghino, 1889 over the senior spelling *Phorusrhacos* Ameghino, 1887, which was used in the combination *Phorusrhacos longissimus* Ameghino, 1887, new genus and species. Their

justification for this lies with the spelling *Phororhacos* having been used by practically all authors after 1889 until the publication of Brodkorb's (1967) *Catalogue*, and also because of the fear of confusion resulting from supposedly having to retain the family spelling PHORORHACIDAE even if the genus *Phorusrhacos* were used. These arguments seem neither compelling nor valid, however.

Because the species name *longissimus* must still date from the 1887 publication in the original combination *Phorusrhacos longissimus*, substitution of the junior emendation *Phororhacos* for the generic name would not be without some level of bibliographic confusion itself. For this reason, and because it is always desirable not to circumvent priority unnecessarily, the spelling *Phorusrhacos* should be retained. As Chiappe & Soria have shown, most recent authors, following Brodkorb (1967), have already adopted this usage without undue confusion. The name *Phorusrhacos* is consequently well established in the modern literature, is widely understood, and need not be changed once again.

Contrary to the interpretation of Chiappe & Soria, I do not consider that Article 40a of the Code applies to this case and therefore it is not necessary to retain the name PHORORHACIDAE as the family name to include *Phorusrhacos*. Article 40a states that a family name is to be retained even if it is based on a 'rejected junior synonym'. *Phororhacos*, however, is merely an unjustified emendation of *Phorusrhacos*. PHORORHACIDAE is itself but an emendation of Ameghino's 'PHORORHACOSIDAE', and there is no reason to regard the name PHORUSRHACIDAE as anything more than Brodkorb's (1967) having merely extended this process of emendation.

Because both priority and current usage are in agreement in this case, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked not to invoke its plenary powers to accept the proposals on BZN **47**: 199, but instead to support the status quo by placing the following names on the relevant Official Lists:

(1) *Phorusrhacos* Ameghino, 1887 (gender: masculine), type species by monotypy *Phorusrhacos longissimus* Ameghino, 1887;

(2) *longissimus* Ameghino, 1887, as published in the binomen *Phorusrhacos longissimus* (specific name of the type species of *Phorusrhacos* Ameghino, 1887);

(3) PHORUSRHACIDAE Ameghino, 1889 (type genus *Phorusrhacos* Ameghino, 1887) (correction by Brodkorb (1967) of PHORORHACOSIDAE).

(2) Walter J. Bock
Department of Biological Sciences, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, U.S.A.

Members of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature (SCON) of the International Ornithological Congress have unanimously supported the proposed conservation of *Phororhacos* Ameghino, 1889 and the suppression of *Phorusrhacos* Ameghino, 1887. They noted that the action taken by Brodkorb (1963) was counter to the provisions of the Code in force at that time and that Cracraft (1968, 1969) had rejected *Phorusrhacos* Ameghino, 1887 as a nomen oblitum (although unfortunately he had not submitted an application to the Commission). Although a number of workers have used *Phorusrhacos* Ameghino, 1887 since 1963, the result has been instability and lack of universality. Because relatively few papers have been published on these birds during the past three decades, there has been considerably more use of the generic name *Phororhacos* Ameghino, 1889 in the literature.